|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | **Nature of Science: Critical Thinking Evidence- Scenario** | |

Name Block

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CATEGORY | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Clearly Stated Observations | Clearly states 5 observations and 5 inferences using details to support them. | Identifies 5 observations and 5 inferences using some details to support them.  . | Identifies 5 observations and 5 inferences but lacking any detail to support them.  . | Inadequately/ Fails to identify 5 observations and inferences or no details given. |  |
| Scenario | Evidence and reasoning are explained for each possible scenario. Care is given to how each piece of evidence supports the hypothesis. Many details are given. | Evidence and reasoning are explained for each scenario However, explanations are lacking details and precision. | Provides some evidence but not necessarily the best ones to support the development of the student's thinking in connection photo. Tendency towards surface level support of the hypothesis. | Insufficient or no examples shared in an attempt to offer support for student's scenario. |  |
| Making Connections (CM) | Effectively communicates connections among key points, recognizes cause and effect, consistently demonstrates sound logic. | Satisfactorily communicates a connection among key points, indicates a continuity, recognizes a cause or an effect, mostly demonstrates sound logic. | Little connection is made among key points. Lacks deeper development and demonstration of sound logic. | Basically restates or summarizes with no attempt at communicating deeper ideas. Noted lack of sound logic. May even demonstrate faulty reasoning. |  |